

**Opening Statement of Republican Leader David B. McKinley  
Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change Hearing on “TSCA and  
Public Health: Fulfilling the Promise of the Lautenberg Act”  
October 27, 2021**

*As Prepared for Delivery*

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Former Chairman of this subcommittee, John Shimkus, and his staff worked tireless to get the Lautenberg Act passed in 2016 - the first amendments to TSCA in nearly 40 years. And now, five years later, this committee is looking at how it's been implemented.

With its passage, the Lautenberg Act provided for much-needed changes so that the U.S. can unlock the potential of its chemical industry. EPA administers this statute, but unfortunately, instead of promoting innovation and supporting the chemical industry - as the act intended - it seems like EPA is stifling innovation and creating barriers to commerce for new and existing chemicals

The chemical industry is a key component of the U.S. supply chain. We can all see that getting products from overseas is not working. Our ports are backing up and deliveries are missing deadlines. But now EPA wants to regulate more than just chemicals, like an imported article that may contain a regulated

chemical, thereby disrupting the supply chain.

And look at the new chemicals program.....known as the “gateway to innovation.” There is a significant backlog of new chemicals at EPA awaiting approval. And recent policy changes at EPA will only slow things down.

Mr. Chairman, I’d like to enter into the record an article from Bloomberg from October 20. According to this article, just last week, Assistant Administrator Freedhoff told her staff to: Take more time off including an hour every day for lunch, Not to take meetings on Fridays, limit public engagement, “improve” meetings by “streamlining topics, requesting agendas, and keeping conversations crisp;” and Not to take their work home with them mentally.

Seriously? You’re asking for more money, but for less work. No wonder EPA’s chemical backlog is expanding; how does that statement encourage a more streamlined chemical review process?

There are other issues too, that this committee will discuss today. Mr.

Chairman, Section 902 of the Clean Future Act places a three-year moratorium on permits for plastics facilities. Am I missing something?

The U.S. is striving for a robust chemical industry. But how is that possible with: A backlog of bureaucratic delays in the new chemicals program; the email telling staff to do less; and then a ban on constructing plastics facilities, only further constricting access to U.S.-made PPE, gloves, shields, and masks. These are all necessary for the strategic national stockpile.

What's happening under this administration? I thought the purpose of John Shimkus' efforts with TSCA was to stimulate the potential of the U.S. chemical industry, but this is diametrically opposed to that. Thank you and I yield back.